Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
MAY 1 1978
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLER

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1977

NO. 77-1376

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Appellant,

v.

STATE OF GEORGIA, et al.,
Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court For the Northern District of Georgia

MOTION OF STATE OF GEORGIA TO AFFIRM

ARTHUR K. BOLTON
Attorney General

ROBERT S. STUBBS, II
Executive Assistant
Attorney General

DON A. LANGHAM
First Assistant
Attorney General

MICHAEL J. BOWERS
Senior Assistant
Attorney General

PLEASE ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO:

DON A. LANGHAM
First Assistant Attorney General
132 State Judicial Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
Telephone: (404) 656-3392

April, 1978

INDEX

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED..... 1

ARGUMENT..... 2

I. THE VOTING PROCEDURES WHICH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SEEKS TO HAVE SUBMITTED HAVE ALREADY BEEN SUBMITTED AND APPROVED BY ONE OF HIS PREDECESSORS..... 2

A. THE 1970 GEORGIA SUBMISSION MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT AS IT HAD BEEN INTERPRETED AT THAT TIME 5

B. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL APPROVED THE POST DESIGNATION AND MAJORITY VOTE PROVISIONS OF THE 1970 SUBMISSION..... 7

C. THE *SHEFFIELD* DECISION OF THIS COURT IS NOT APPLICABLE OR CONTROLLING IN THE CASE AT BAR 9

II. ONCE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL HAS PRECLEARED A SUBMITTED STATE STATUTE, HIS SUCCESSORS MAY NOT, SIX YEARS LATER, REPUDIATE THE PRECLEARANCE AND, UNDER §5, REQUIRE RESUBMISSION OF THAT STATUTE..... 11

CONCLUSION..... 14

APPENDIX..... 1a

CITATIONS

Cases:

	Page
Allen v. State Board of Elections, 393 U.S. 544 (1969)	5,10
Automobile Club v. Commissioner, 353 U.S. 180 (1957)	12
Georgia v. United States, 411 U.S. 526 (1972)	11
Pitts v. Busbee, 511 F.2d 126 (5th Cir. 1975)	8
Pitts v. Cates, 536 F.2d 56 (5th Cir. 1976)	8
United States v. San Francisco, 310 U.S. 16 (1939)	12
United States v. Sheffield Board of Commissioners, No. 76-1662, 46 L.W. 4189 (March 6, 1978)	5,9,13
Utah Power and Light v. United States, 243 U.S. 389 (1916)	12

Statutes and Regulations:

Voting Rights Act of 1965, 79 Stat. 437 *et seq.*, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 1973 *et seq*	5,6
Ga. Laws 1964, p. 26 *et seq.*, Ex. Sess., Act 26, Ga. Code 34-101 *et seq.* (the Georgia Election Code)	2
Section 34-1002	3
Section 34-1514	3
Ga. Laws 1970, p. 347 *et seq.*, Act 1079 (H.B. 1304)	4
Section 34-1015	4
Section 34-1513	4
28 C.F.R. Part 51	2,9

Miscellaneous:

36 F.R. 18186	9

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1977

NO. 77-1376

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Appellant,

v.

STATE OF GEORGIA, et al.,
Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court For the Northern District of Georgia

---

MOTION OF STATE OF GEORGIA TO AFFIRM

Now come the State of Georgia, the Governor of Georgia, the Secretary of State of Georgia, and the members of the State Election Board and move the Court to affirm the decision sought to be reviewed on the ground that it is manifest that the questions on which the decision of the cause depends are so insubstantial, and the decision below is so obviously correct, as to not need further argument.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

The United States has presented only one question to the Court:

1. Whether Georgia's state-wide mandatory majority vote and numbered post requirements for primaries

and elections of county governing bodies has [sic] been submitted to the Attorney General pursuant to §5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

However, this appeal raises a second question:

2. Whether after an Attorney General, acting pursuant to §5 of the Voting Rights Act, advised the State of Georgia in 1970 that he had no objection to the "enactment or implementation" of a State election law, a different Attorney General, six years later, may repudiate the preclearance of his predecessor and now require yet another submission under §5 by merely alleging that the predecessor Attorney General did not properly interpret what was submitted to him.

ARGUMENT

I. THE VOTING PROCEDURES WHICH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SEEKS TO HAVE SUBMITTED HAVE ALREADY BEEN SUBMITTED AND APPROVED BY ONE OF HIS PREDECESSORS.

The United States appears to be attempting in this action to secure from the judiciary approval to reconsider each and every submission by states under the Voting Rights Act made prior to the promulgation by the Department of Justice of 28 C.F.R. Part 51. Such an attempt to expand a power already recognized as constituting an extraordinary change in our federal system must not be approved.

In 1964 the Georgia General Assembly completely rewrote this State's election laws by enacting Act 26 [Ga. Laws 1964, p. 26, Ex. Sess.; the Georgia Election Code, Ga. Code 34-101, *et seq.*]. Among other things, Act 26 standardized a number of heretofore different approaches

to election procedures in state-wide and county elections. Included in the uniform concept were requirements that candidates must be elected by a majority vote and that if there are two or more offices with the same title being filled at the same election by the same voters, candidates must designate specifically which office they are seeking (post designation). Act 26 was effective and in use prior to November 1, 1964; however, for the elections of county commissioners, majority vote and post designation did not become effective until January 1, 1965 (former Ga. Code §34-1514 and §34-1002).

As the United States points out on pages 6-7 of its Jurisdictional Statement, Georgia made four submissions to the Attorney General pursuant to §5 of the Voting Rights Act between 1968 and 1971 which contained the text of enactments that included post designation or majority vote procedures, or both, identical to those in Act 26. However, the United States failed to point out that the 1968 submission also included Act 26 itself, together with an explanation that it was a complete revision so that the Attorney General would be aware of the exact language of the 1964 revision as it might relate to the later enactments.

Even if the 1968 submission did not properly place the majority vote and post designation provisions before the Attorney General for review, formal and proper submissions made in 1969, 1970 and 1971 did precisely that. The most cogent evidence of this was the 1970 submission as a part of which both the majority vote and post designation provisions were submitted for preclearance and approved by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, acting on behalf of the Attorney General. That submission

was of the *entire* 1970 act (HB 1304) which repealed the earlier post designation and majority vote sections of the Georgia Election Code and replaced them with new sections, designated as Ga. Code §§34-1015 and 34-1513 respectively. A copy of the response from the Assistant Attorney General was omitted from the Jurisdictional Statement but is attached to this motion as Appendix 1a. The Assistant Attorney General was absolutely clear that:

> "The Attorney General would not, at this time, interpose an objection *to the enactment or implementation* of House Bill 1304." [Emphasis Added].

Contrary to the present assertion of the United States, the approval was not for some nebulous limited purpose which could reasonably be construed as excluding the post designation and majority vote provisions. Rather, it clearly was an approval of HB 1304 in its entirety which must, by any logic, include all the provisions of that statute.

As will be pointed out later in this motion, until this action was brought in 1976, it was commonly accepted by everyone concerned, *including the Attorney General himself*, that the post designation and majority vote provisions of the Georgia law as they applied to county commission elections had been submitted to and approved by the Attorney General.[1] This factual question was fully explored by the three-judge district court and addressed in its decision (Jurisdictional Statement pp. 11A-12A).

---

[1] As is pointed out in the *1978* report of the Attorney General (Appendix 3a), he *still* reports that he approved the post designation and majority vote provisions of HB 1304.

A. THE 1970 GEORGIA SUBMISSION MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT AS IT HAD BEEN INTERPRETED AT THAT TIME.

The Voting Rights Act prohibits any state or political subdivision from enacting or seeking to administer any voting requirement different from that in force or effect on November 1, 1964, without first securing from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia a declaratory judgment that such requirement does not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, or in contravention of certain other guarantees set forth in the Act. 42 U.S.C. §1973c. A state or political subdivision is permitted by the Act, however, to pursue an alternative course of action before administering a new voting requirement. This alternative course is submission of the new requirement to the Attorney General for his consideration. *Id.* It is the finality *vel non* of this consideration by the Attorney General that is the subject matter of this litigation.

In 1970 the Justice Department had not yet established regulations concerning the form of submissions under the Voting Rights Act (hereinafter the "Act"). The only standards were those set forth in the Act as interpreted by this Court in *Allen v. State Board of Elections*, 393 U.S. 544 (1969).[2]

---

[2] During the period 1965-1970, there were only a total of approximately 600 submissions, or an average of 120 each year. [Footnote 8 to the dissent by Mr. Justice Stevens in *United States v. Sheffield Board of Commissioners*, No. 76-1662, 46 L.W. 4189 (March 6, 1968)]. Presumably, the Justice Department reviewed each of these submissions carefully.

The United States argues that the State of Georgia should have anticipated in 1970 what procedures the Attorney General would establish in 1971 and then have followed the yet to be developed procedures by specifically pointing out in the 1970 submission the changes made by HB 1304. The United States further argues that the failure of the State of Georgia to point out all relevant provisions in HB 1304 is absolute proof that the then Attorney General did not consider and preclear the post designation and majority vote provisions. The United States not only ignores all the evidence to the contrary, but it also mistakenly interprets the 1970 submission requirements established by the law and *Allen*.

The Act (§5) expressly requires nothing more than that "the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice or procedure" be submitted. In *Allen*, this Court, in rejecting arguments that an adequate submission occurred when the Attorney General became aware of a state enactment by virtue of being served with briefs in which such enactments were referenced, held that a fair interpretation of the Act requires only the following:

(a) A submission must be made directly to the Attorney General,

(b) The legislation or other change must be submitted in a clear and unambiguous manner, and

(c) The Attorney General must be requested to consider the new legislation pursuant to the Act. *Id.* at 571.

There is absolutely nothing in the *Allen* decision, and there were not yet any clarifying regulations when the challenged 1970 submission was made by Georgia, which required a state to point out to the Justice Department

what the differences were between the old practice and the new law. The requirement in 1970 was that Georgia submit the new practice or procedure in an unambiguous manner. What can be more unambiguous than a new law itself?

B. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL APPROVED THE POST DESIGNATION AND MAJORITY VOTE PROVISIONS OF THE 1970 SUBMISSION.

The United States alleges error by the three-judge district court in its factual determination that a submission of the post designation and majority vote provisions was made by Georgia pursuant to §5 and tosses aside, as "an error" and a "partial mistake," the acknowledgment by the Attorney General in 1973 that he had approved post designation in 1970. (Jurisdictional Statement, p. 14).

There was ample evidence before the district court to support its finding and decision that the submission was approved by the Attorney General. First, of course, is the fact that the 1970 submission stated:

> "The Bill [HB 1304] revises the Election Code in all respects to reflect this intention, together with certain other minor housekeeping changes which are self-explanatory."
>
> (Jurisdictional Statement, 11A). [Bracketed Matter Added].

The response of the Attorney General was:

> "The Attorney General will not at this time interpose an objection to the enactment or implementation of HB 1304." (Appendix 1a to this Motion).

Even if this exchange of submission and response in 1970 left some doubt as to its breadth, the Attorney

General himself interpreted the extent of his approval of the State's submission when in 1973 he stated:

> "Our subsequent examination of this situation indicates that this statute [as it related to post designation] was submitted to the Attorney General in 1970 pursuant to §5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and no objection was interposed." (Jurisdictional Statement, p. 14A). [Bracketed Matter Added].

While clearly the United States wishes that that letter was not written (since it is now characterized as an "error"), it was in fact written and did in fact evidence the conclusion of the Attorney General as to the extent of Georgia's 1970 submission.

Further, both the District Court for the Northern District of Georgia and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals have relied upon the Attorney General's approval of the majority vote features in HB 1304. Such reliance is evidenced in recent litigation concerning election of Fulton County Commissioners. *See Pitts v. Busbee*, 511 F.2d 126 (5th Cir. 1975) and *Pitts v. Cates*, 536 F.2d 56 (5th Cir. 1976). While these decisions are not res judacata as to the United States, they are further evidence of the general acceptance over the years of the 1970 preclearance of post designation and majority vote by the Justice Department.

Finally, and perhaps most telling is the position of the United States since its Jurisdictional Statement was filed. In an entirely unrelated matter, Georgia requested from the Attorney General a list of all submissions made by the State of Georgia since the enactment of the Voting Rights Act and the action taken on those submissions by the Attorney General. Such a list was prepared by the Attorney General on March 28, 1978, and received by the

State of Georgia on April 20, 1978. That list, *provided by the current Attorney General after he filed his Jurisdictional Statement in this case* (in which he denied approval was ever given in 1970 to post designation and majority vote) states that *approval for these two election devices was given on May 22, 1970. See* Appendix 3a to this Motion.[3]

The position being advocated by the United States in this appeal is contrary to its own public record. Is this another "error" and "partial mistake" which both this Court and Georgia are supposed to ignore? Is not the State of Georgia entitled to assume that preclearance is final at some point in time?

C. THE *SHEFFIELD* DECISION OF THIS COURT IS NOT APPLICABLE OR CONTROLLING IN THE CASE AT BAR.

In its Jurisdictional Statement, the United States erroneously argues that the recent decision of this Court in *United States v. Sheffield Board of Commissioners*, No. 76-1662, 46 L.W. 4189 (March 6, 1978), is dispositive of this case. (Jurisdictional Statement, pp. 12, 16). The factual background in *Sheffield* is totally inapposite.

In the first place, any submissions in *Sheffield* were pursuant to the regulations of the Attorney General (28 C.F.R. Part 51). The United States, on page 13 of its Jurisdictional Statement, points out the fact the Court noted in *Sheffield* that "there are *today* regulations governing the form of submissions which make it clear that [submissions] must 'clearly set forth' the new rule. . . ."

The regulations, which played such an important part in *Sheffield*, had not yet been promulgated at the time of Georgia's 1970 submission.[4] Rather, Georgia had no

[3] This information is included pursuant to Rule 16(5) of this Court since it is new matter not earlier available.

[4] The regulations governing the form and specific requirements of a submission were not published until September 10, 1971, long after the submissions at issue here. (36 F.R. 18186).

guidance as to the form of the submission except the very general language of the Act and the interpretation of that language by this Court in *Allen v. State Board of Elections, supra.* It is incredible that an Attorney General should, six years after a submission, seek to apply retroactively the requirements of regulations promulgated one year after the submission in question.

Another relevant distinction between *Sheffield* and this case concerns the contemporaneous actions of the Attorney General. In *Sheffield*, only the referendum was submitted to the Attorney General for preclearance. He then specifically advised the city that he was approving only the referendum and not the proposed change to the mayor-council form of government. He specifically warned the city a further submission would be required and further advised it of the information it must submit before he could preclear. When the city failed to do so, he *promptly* brought an action pursuant to §5 of the Voting Rights Act.

Compare those facts with the situation in this case. In 1970, HB 1304 in its entirety, including post designation and majority vote, was submitted to the Attorney General, who gave preclearance to the *entire statute*. He did not seek further information and did not advise or warn Georgia that any further actions or submissions were necessary. Then, he issued an interpretation in 1973 and documentation in 1978 reflecting that he had, in fact, approved those aspects of the Georgia election process which the United States claims need to be resubmitted. There is no evidence that the Attorney General did not intend to approve the change; rather, all of the evidence supports the finding of the district court that the Attorney General intended to approve the now disputed changes,

unsupported conclusions in the United States' Jurisdictional Statement as to a "partial mistake" to the contrary notwithstanding.

Thus, the factual basis for this Court's decision in *Sheffield* is lacking here, making that decision totally inapplicable to the case at bar.

II. ONCE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL HAS PRECLEARED A SUBMITTED STATE STATUTE, HIS SUCCESSORS MAY NOT, SIX YEARS LATER, REPUDIATE THE PRECLEARANCE AND, UNDER §5, REQUIRE RESUBMISSION OF THAT STATUTE.

The United States seeks to repudiate the 1970 preclearance of HB 1304 by the Attorney General and his 1973 interpretation of that preclearance, classifying these actions as "errors" and "partial mistakes." Presumably, it will do likewise as to the April 10, 1978, documentation. It claims that the preclearance should be repudiated since "partial mistakes" "cannot bar vindication of public interest."

Such a cavalier approach by the United States ignores the unique responsibilities placed on the Attorney General by the Voting Rights Act and, unfortunately, bears out possible concerns previously expressed by this Court in 1972 that there may well be unwarranted administrative conduct by the Attorney General in frivolously interfering with laws of vital concern to the states covered by the Voting Rights Act. *Georgia v. United States*, 411 U.S. 526, 541; 36 L.Ed.2d 472, 485 (1972).

As this Court has repeatedly held, the purpose of the provision in §5 permitting a submission to the Attorney

General in lieu of bringing a declaratory judgment action in the District Court of the District of Columbia is to provide a speedy mechanism by which a state can implement election changes. This result obtains from the requirement that the Attorney General act within sixty days of the submission. *Allen v. State Board of Elections, supra; Georgia v. United States, supra; United States v. Sheffield, supra.*

If the United States were permitted to prevail in this action, the "speedy" method of Attorney General approval would be totally emasculated. Not one single submission to the Attorney General which has heretofore been made or which might in the future be "approved" by the Attorney General will be safe from future challenge by him. The Attorney General will merely have to state that a particular submission approval was "in error" or a "partial mistake" as the United States has attempted to characterize approval of the post designation and majority vote features of the 1970 submission.

Georgia would agree that, under normal circumstances, administrative decisions by public officials which are an incorrect interpretation of the law will not preclude an action to vindicate a public interest. Georgia has no quarrel whatsoever with the rules laid down by this Court in such cases as the *Automobile Club v. Commissioner*, 353 U.S. 180 (1957); *United States v. San Francisco*, 310 U.S. 16 (1939); and, *Utah Power and Light Company v. United States*, 243 U.S. 389 (1916).

However, the United States now asks this Court to render a decision which would have the effect of eliminating the finality of a preclearance by the Attorney General. It would have this Court permit an Attorney General at any time to declare that a preclearance by a previous

Attorney General was an "error" or a "partial mistake" and to require the state or political subdivision to make a new submission.

Such a ruling by the Court would create havoc. Since 1970, when the submission at issue was precleared during the term of Attorney General John Mitchell, there have been six different persons holding the office of Attorney General. Their policies, practices, and even philosophies as to the approach to insure the proper enforcement and implementation of the Voting Rights Act, as well as other federal non-discriminatory statutes, have varied. This is, of course, a fact of political life.

It is not pure speculation that election practices or procedures approved by one Attorney General might later fall into disfavor during the term of another Attorney General. It was not the intent of Congress that each Attorney General could review all election procedures precleared by his predecessors and require a resubmission of those procedures which he does not believe to be appropriate. If an election practice or procedure has the effect of violating the constitutional rights of the citizens of that jurisdiction, procedures have long been available to enjoin that unconstitutional provision. A resubmission under §5 is not required.

As Mr. Justice Stevens pointed out in his dissent in *Sheffield:*

> "This so-called 'preclearance' requirement is one of the most extraordinary remedial provisions in the Act noted for its broad remedies. Even the Department of Justice has described it as a 'substantial departure . . . from ordinary concepts of our federal system.' " (*Sheffield, supra* at 4197).

The authority of the Attorney General in that "substantial departure" must be narrowly construed. Once an election device has been precleared, as was the entire Georgia 1970 statute, and certainly after the Attorney General not once, but twice (1973 and 1978) states he has precleared the disputed provisions, another Attorney General (or another division of the Department of Justice) cannot take it upon himself to repudiate that preclearance.

CONCLUSION

The State of Georgia has been using majority vote and post designation as part of its election procedure for all elected offices, including the election of county commissioners, for years.

The State was under the belief that these procedures had been precleared. The Attorney General was under the belief that these procedures had been precleared. The decisions of a United States District Court and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals illustrate the federal courts were under the belief that these procedures had been precleared. Even the records of the Attorney General continue to state as of this date that these procedures have been precleared.

The district court decided that preclearance had been obtained, and pointed out that the eleven year delay of the Justice Department in bringing this action is inexcusable and would place the electoral system of the State in an uproar.

As that court said, this action by the Justice Department "borders on the absurd" (Jurisdictional Statement, p. 12A).

They were absolutely correct, and this Motion to Affirm their decision should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTHUR K. BOLTON
Attorney General

ROBERT S. STUBBS, II
Executive Assistant Attorney General

DON A. LANGHAM
First Assistant Attorney General

MICHAEL J. BOWERS
Senior Assistant Attorney General

PLEASE ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO:

DON A. LANGHAM
First Assistant Attorney General
132 State Judicial Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
Telephone: (404) 656-3392

April, 1978

APPENDIX

Department of Justice
Washington

MAY - 1970

Honorable Arthur K. Bolton
Attorney General
State of Georgia
132 State Judicial Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Dear Mr. Attorney General:

This is in reference to the submission of House Bill 1304 to the Attorney General pursuant to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The submission was received at this Department March 24, 1970.

The Attorney General will not at this time interpose an objection to the enactment or implementation of House Bill 1304. However, please be aware that the failure to object does not bar any future legal action to enjoin enforcement of the changes.

Sincerely,

JERRIS LEONARD
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20530

Address Reply to the Division Indicated and Refer to Initials and Number
DSD:DHH:JAS:bmp
DJ 166-012-3

APR 18 1978

Mr. Michael J. Bowers
Senior Assistant Attorney General
State of Georgia
The Department of Law
132 State Judicial Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Dear Mr. Bowers:

Pursuant to your letter of March 27, 1978 and telephone conversation with the undersigned on March 24, 1978, we are enclosing for your information a copy of our most recent public computer printout for the State of Georgia.

As you requested we did not include the list of submissions by political subdivisions of the State of Georgia concerning local changes in voting matters.

Sincerely,

DREW S. DAYS III
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

By: David H. Hunter
DAVID H. HUNTER
Attorney, Voting Section

04/10/78 REPORT 6 PAGE 48

INDEX OF SECTION 5 SUBMISSIONS AS OF 03/28/78
BY LOCATION AND DATE

STATE OF GEORGIA

SUB.	COUNTY	CITY	TYPE OF CHANGE	DESCRIPTION	ACT	YEAR	STATUS	RESUBM.	LITIGATION	RECEIVED	NOTIFIED
V3677			REDIST	STATE SENATE			OBJECTION			01/06/72	03/03/72
V3678			REDIST	GEORGIA HOUSE			OBJECTION			01/06/72	03/03/72
S1491			LAW	ELECTION BD RULE	RULES	1970	NO OBJECTN			01/20/70	03/13/70
V6178			LAW	CAND QUAL METHOD	ACT 757	1974	NO OBJECTN			02/06/74	02/28/74
V6179			LAW	NOM PETITION	ACT 757	1974	NO OBJECTN			02/06/74	02/28/74
V6180			LAW	REDUCE FEES-CAND	ACT 757	1974	NO OBJECTN			02/06/74	02/28/74
V6181			LAW	PETIT CIRCULATOR	ACT 757	1974	NO OBJECTN			02/06/74	02/28/74
X2550			LAW	STATE ELECT BOAR			NO OBJECTN			02/09/76	04/09/76
V6217			REDIST	STATE HOUSE	ACT 769	1974	NO OBJECTN			02/26/74	05/13/74
A0226			LAW	CONSTIT AMENDMEN	HR-493-	1913	NO OBJECTN			03/08/77	05/05/77
V4065			REDIST	STATE SENATE	HB 2085	1972	NO OBJECTN			03/15/72	04/11/72
V4066			REDIST	STATE HOUSE	SB 690	1972	OBJECTION		DJ PENDING	03/15/72	03/24/72
V4067			REDIST	CONGRESSIONAL	HB 1862	1972	NO OBJECTN			03/15/72	04/11/72
T7938			LAW	FILING FEES	HB 1304	1970	NO OBJECTN			03/24/70	05/22/70
T7939			LAW	CONDUCT PRIMARY	HB 1304	1970	NO OBJECTN			03/24/70	05/22/70
T7940			LAW	CONDUCT CONVENTN	HB 1304	1970	NO OBJECTN			03/24/70	05/22/70
T7941			LAW	ABSENTEE BALLOTS	HB 1304	1970	NO OBJECTN			03/24/70	05/22/70
T7942			LAW	CAND QUALIFICATN	HB 1304	1970	NO OBJECTN			03/24/70	05/22/70
T7943			LAW	NUMBERED POSTS	HB 1304	1970	NO OBJECTN			03/24/70	05/22/70
T7944			LAW	MAJORITY REQUIRE	HB 1304	1970	NO OBJECTN			03/24/70	05/22/70
S1512			LAW	BALLOT COUNTNG	ACT 537	1965	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/68
S1513			LAW	TEMP ELECTN DATE	ACT 103	1965	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/68
S1514			LAW	PETITION DATE	ACT 118	1965	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/68
S1515			LAW	BALLOT FORMAT	ACT 120	1965	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/67
S1516			LAW	OVERVOTING	ACT 120	1965	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/68
S1517			LAW	FILING DATE/G.A.	ACT 296	1965	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/68
S1518			LAW	SPECIAL ELE/G.A.	ACT 1	1965	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/68
S1519			LAW	ABSENTEE VOTING	ACT 60	1965	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/68
S1520			LAW	WRITE-IN NOTICE	RES 104	1965	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/68
S1521			LAW	ABOL AT-LRG/SEN	ACT 574	1966	NO OBJECTN		PVT-DECIDE	03/25/68	06/27/68
S1522			LAW	QUALIF DATES	ACT 556	1966	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/68
S1523			LAW	ELECT SUPRIOR CT	RES 47	1966	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/68

STATE OF GEORGIA

SUB.	COUNTY	CITY	TYPE OF CHANGE	DESCRIPTION	ACT	YEAR	STATUS	RESUBM.	LITIGATION	RECEIVED	NOTIFIED
S1524			LAW	ELECT SG	RES 109	1966	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/68
S1525			LAW	RESIDENCY	RES 113	1966	NO OBJECTN			03/25/68	06/27/68
X5387				SUPPLY BALLOTS	963-	1976	NO OBJECTN			03/25/76	03/31/76
X5388			LAW	ELECTION DATE	954-	1976	NO OBJECTN			03/25/76	03/31/76
T6802			LAW	GA VACANCY	ACT 777	1970	NO OBJECTN			04/10/70	06/09/70
T6803			LAW	MAJORITY REQ	ACT1077	1970	NO OBJECTN			04/10/70	06/09/70
T6804			LAW	HOME RULE	ACT1078	1970	NO OBJECTN			04/10/70	06/09/70
T6805			LAW	RESIDENCY	ACT1080	1970	NO OBJECTN			04/10/70	06/09/70
X6384			LAW	STATE ACTS			NO OBJECTN			04/22/76	06/21/76
X7011			LAW	RECOUNT BALLOT	817-	1976	NO OBJECTN			04/22/76	06/21/76
X7012			LAW	REG PROCEDURE	948-	1976	NO OBJECTN			04/22/76	06/21/76
X7013				VOT MACHINE	949-	1976	NO OBJECTN			04/22/76	06/21/76
X7014			LAW	CANDIDATE QUAL	952-	1976	NO OBJECTN			04/22/76	06/21/76
S1441			LAW	ELECTN BD SIZE	ACT 992	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1442			LAW	DEFINE POL PARTY	ACT 992	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1443			LAW	PROHIB WRITE-INS	ACT 997	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1444			LAW	ASSISTANCE	ACT 997	1968	OBJECTION			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1472			LAW	PRESIDENTL VOTE	ACT 988	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1473			LAW	NOM PETITION	ACT 997	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1474			LAW	MODFD STR TICKET	ACT 987	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1475			LAW	CAMPGN LITERATUR	ACT 985	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1476			LAW	RESIDENCY	ACT 986	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1477			LAW	REGISTER STUDENT	ACT 676	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1478			LAW	PRECINCT SIZE	ACT 990	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1479			LAW	CONVENTION DATES	ACT 989	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1480			LAW	INCUMBENT QUALIF	ACT 983	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1481			LAW	PRES ELECTOR PET	ACT 698	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1482			LAW	PLURALITY/PRES	ACT 698	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1483			LAW	NOMINATION CONV	ACT 993	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1484			LAW	FILING FEES	ACT 994	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1485			LAW	VOTE RECORDERS	ACT 991	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1486			LAW	RUN-OFF/GOVERNOR	ACT 137	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68

S1487			LAW	SUCCESSION	ACT 133	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1488			LAW	RUN-OFF/ST OFF	ACT 136	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1489			LAW	TERMS/GEN ASSY	ACT 140	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
S1490			LAW	TERMS/NO CHANGE	ACT 994	1968	NO OBJECTN			04/23/68	06/19/68
V6423			LAW	ABSENTEE BALLOT	ACT 770	1974	NO OBJECTN			04/23/74	06/20/74
V6424			LAW	BALLOT FOR MILIT	ACT 770	1974	NO OBJECTN			04/23/74	06/20/74
V6425			LAW	OATH FOR BALLOT	ACT 770	1974	NO OBJECTN			04/23/74	06/20/74

V6426			LAW	NO DOCTOR CERT	ACT 770	1974	NO OBJECTN			04/23/74	06/20/74
V6427			LAW	PENALITIES-INFO	ACT 770	1974	NO OBJECTN			04/23/74	06/20/74
V6428			LAW	DISABLED-ASSIST	ACT 770	1974	NO OBJECTN			04/23/74	06/20/74
V6429			LAW	AMENDS CODE-T 34	ACT 770	1974	NO OBJECTN			04/23/74	06/20/74
T7945			LAW	REGIS IN HI SCLS	ACT 141	1971	NO OBJECTN			05/03/71	07/02/71
T7946			LAW	DATES	ACT 543	1971	NO OBJECTN			05/03/71	07/02/71
T7947			LAW	WITHDRAWAL	ACT 543	1971	NO OBJECTN			05/03/71	07/02/71
T7948			LAW	ELECTION BOARD	ACT 543	1971	NO OBJECTN			05/03/71	07/02/71
T7950			LAW	DURATIONAL RESCY	RES 22	1971	NO OBJECTN			05/03/71	07/02/71
A0901			LAW	CANDIDATE REQ	ACT-7-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/09/77	07/08/77
A0902			LAW	CANDIDACY REQ	178-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/09/77	07/08/77
A0903			LAW	BALLOT LABELS	671-	1977	NO OBJEDTN			05/09/77	07/08/77
A0946			LAW	REG VOTER MAJORI	ACT-21-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/10/77	07/11/77
A0947			LAW	TERMS COUNCIL	ACT-50-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/10/77	07/11/77
A0960			LAW	RECALL PROVISION	ACT-51-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/10/77	07/11/77
A0948			LAW	SOLICITING VOTES	ACT -8-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/12/77	07/11/77
A0949			LAW	SUPERIOR COURT J	11-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/12/77	07/11/77
A0950			LAW	SOLICITATION SIG	12-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/12/77	07/11/77
A0951			LAW	VOTER CERTIFICAT	183-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/12/77	07/11/77
A0952				ABSENTEE BALLOT	241-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/12/77	07/11/77
A0953			LAW	ABSENTEE BAL APP	288-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/12/77	07/11/77
A0954			LAW	SUPPLY ABSENTEE	289-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/12/77	07/11/77
A0955			LAW	CHALLENGE TO ABS	308-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/12/77	07/11/77
A0956			LAW	ELEC INFO CANDID	639-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/12/77	07/11/77
A0957				VOTE MACHINES	672-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/12/77	07/11/77
A0958			PRECNCT	ELEC DIST NOTIFI	673-	1977	NO OBJECTN			05/12/77	07/11/77
S1445			LAW	QUALIFICATN TEST	ACT 998	1968	OBJECTION			05/15/68	07/11/68
S1446			LAW	ASSISTANCE	ACT 998	1968	OBJECTION			05/15/68	07/11/68
S1447			LAW	QUALIF/POLL OFF	ACT 998	1968	OBJECTION			05/15/68	07/11/68
S1448			LAW	REGISTRTN PERIOD	ACT 998	1968	NO OBJECTN			05/15/68	07/11/68

STATE OF GEORGIA

SUB.	COUNTY	CITY	TYPE OF CHANGE	DESCRIPTION	ACT	YEAR	STATUS	RESUBM.	LITIGATION	RECEIVED	NOTIFIED
S1449			LAW	WRITE-IN STICKER	ACT 998	1968	NO OBJECTN			05/15/68	07/11/68
S1450			LAW	MACHINE INSTRUCT	ACT 998	1968	NO OBJECTN			05/15/68	07/11/68
S1451			LAW	MUNICIPAL REGIS	ACT 993	1968	NO OBJECTN			05/15/68	07/11/68
V6517			LAW	CAMPAIGN FINANCE	ACT 803	1974	NO OBJECTN			05/16/74	06/27/74
V4453			LAW	CANDIDATE QUALIF	ACT 918	1972	NO OBJECTN			05/22/72	07/06/72
V4454			LAW	ALCOHOL REFEREND	ACT 865	1972	NO OBJECTN			05/22/72	07/06/72
V4455			LAW	CANDIDATE QUALIF	ACT1305	1972	NO OBJECTN			05/22/72	07/06/72
V4456			LAW	AID TO DRAW PCTS	ACT1015	1972	NO OBJECTN			05/22/72	07/06/72
V4457			LAW	SCL BD QUALIFINS	ACT 872	1972	NO OBJECTN			05/22/72	07/06/72
V4458			LAW	HOME RULE AMEND	ACT1268	1972	NO OBJECTN			05/22/72	07/06/72
V4459			LAW	PURGE THE DEAD	ACT1570	1972	NO OBJECTN			05/22/72	07/06/72
V4460			LAW	ALC ON ELECT DAY	ACT1233	1972	NO OBJECTN			05/22/72	07/06/72
V4461			LAW	ABOLSH TREASURER	RES 250	1972	NO OBJECTN			05/22/72	07/06/72
X6866			LAW	CAMPAIGN FINANCE	1363-	1976	NO OBJECTN			05/27/76	07/22/76
X6867			LAW	18 YRS OLD OFF	950-	1976	NO OBJECTN			05/27/76	07/22/76
X6869			LAW	ST ELEC BOARD			NO OBJECTN			05/27/76	07/16/76
X6870			LAW	ST ELEC BOARD			NO OBJECTN			05/27/76	07/16/76
X6871			LAW	ST ELEC BOARD			NO OBJECTN			05/27/76	07/16/76
V6561			LAW	VOTERS RESID REQ	ACT 772	1974	NO OBJECTN			05/28/74	07/22/74
V6562			LAW	PURGING VOTERS	ACT 772	1974	NO OBJECTN			05/28/74	07/22/74
V6563			LAW	PRIMARY DATE	ACT 916	1974	NO OBJECTN			05/28/74	07/22/74
V6564			LAW	AMEND MUN EL COD	ACT 771	1974	NO OBJECTN			05/28/74	07/22/74
V6565			LAW	ELECTORS LIST	ACT 771	1974	NO OBJECTN			05/28/74	07/22/74
V6566			LAW	PROHIBITS WRITEI	ACT 771	1974	NO OBJECTN			05/28/74	07/22/74
V6567			LAW	CAMPAIGN LIT	ACT 771	1974	NO OBJECTN			05/28/74	07/22/74
V6568			LAW	RES REQ-VOTERS	ACT 773	1974	NO OBJECTN			05/28/74	07/22/74
V6569			LAW	BALLOT CARDS	ACT 773	1974	NO OBJECTN			05/28/74	07/22/74
V6570			LAW	CANDIDACY NOTICE	ACT 993	1974	NO OBJECTN			05/28/74	07/22/74
S1455			LAW	RUN-OFF/GOVERNOR	ACT 137	1968	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	06/23/70
S1456			LAW	RUN-OFF/ST OFF	ACT 136	1968	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1457			LAW	SUCCESSION	ACT 133	1968	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1458			LAW	VACANCY/CTY SUPT	ACT 220	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1459			LAW	VACANCY/ORDINARY	ACT 221	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69

S1460			LAW	VACANCY/SURVEYOR	ACT 225	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1461			LAW	APPOINT CONSTABL	ACT 226	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1462			LAW	REMOVE TESTS	ACT 219	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1463			LAW	ABSENTEE, ETC	ACT 224	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1464			LAW	POLL WATCHERS	ACT 223	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1465			LAW	COUNTING BALLOTS	ACT 223	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1466			LAW	NON-PARTISAN/SPC	ACT 223	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1467			LAW	COUNT ABSENTEE	ACT 217	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69

S1468			LAW	RECOUNT	ACT 222	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1469			LAW	RUN-OFF PROVISNS	ACT 222	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1470			LAW	CHANGE ADDRESS	ACT 224	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1471			LAW	INDEP FILNG DATE	ACT 224	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/06/69	08/05/69
S1452			LAW	ABOL PARTY PRMRY	ACT 218	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/11/69	08/11/69
S1453			LAW	ABSENTEE VOTE	ACT 230	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/11/69	08/11/69
S1454			LAW	STRAIGHT TICKET	ACT 230	1969	NO OBJECTN			06/11/69	08/11/69
A0565			LAW	BD OF ELECTIONS	692-	1977	NO OBJECTN			06/17/77	08/09/77
S1495			LAW	ASSISTANCE	ACT 399	1966	NO OBJECTN	PVT-DECIDE		06/27/66	/ /
A0926			LAW	BD OF ELECTIONS	ACT -4-	1977	NO OBJECTN			06/27/77	08/09/77
A0927			LAW	CANDIDATE DISCLO	741-	1977	NO OBJECTN			06/27/77	08/09/77
V8886			LAW		ACT 621	1975	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8887			LAW		ACT 457	1975	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8888			LAW		ACT 470	1975	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8889			LAW		ACT 527	1975	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8890			LAW		ACT 528	1975	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8891			LAW		ACT 529	1975	NO OBJECTN			05/30/75	07/02/75
V8892			LAW		ACT 530	1975	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8893			LAW		ACT 564	1975	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8894			LAW		ACT 568	1975	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8895			LAW		ACT 570	1975	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8896			LAW		ACT 579	1975	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8897			LAW		ACT 97	1973	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8898			LAW		ACT 666	1975	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8899			LAW		ACT 677	1975	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
V8901			LAW	SP2	ACT 77	1973	NO OBJECTN			06/30/75	07/02/75
A1776			LAW	CTY OFFICIAL FEL	840-	1976	NO OBJECTN			07/15/77	09/16/77
A1769			LAW	QUAL GEN ASSEMBL	287-	1977	NO OBJECTN			07/19/77	09/16/77
A1770			LAW	QUAL SHERIFFS	660-	1977	NO OBJECTN			07/19/77	09/16/77
S1492			LAW	TESTS, DEVICES	RULES	1968	OBJECTION			08/22/68	08/30/68

STATE OF GEORGIA

SUB.	COUNTY	CITY	TYPE OF CHANGE	DESCRIPTION	ACT	YEAR	STATUS	RESUBM	LITIGATION	RECEIVED	NOTIFIED
S1496			LAW	CHECK FOR DUPLCT	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
S1497			LAW	CHG OF RESIDENCE	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
S1498			LAW	CHG OF DISTRICTS	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
S1499			LAW	VOTE RECORDERS	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
S1500			LAW	TABULATING CENTR	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
S1501			LAW	COMPUTER PROGRAM	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
S1502			LAW	BALLOT ENVELOPES	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
S1503			LAW	DEFECTIVE BALLOT	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
S1504			LAW	WRITE-IN BALLOTS	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
S1505			LAW	OBSERVERS	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
S1506			LAW	MARKING BALLOTS	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
S1507			LAW	ABSENTEE VOTING	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
S1508			LAW	ABSENTEE ENVELOP	RULES	1968	NO OBJECTN			08/22/68	08/30/68
V3625			LAW	COMPLY WITH VRA	ACT 14	1971	NO OBJECTN			10/19/71	12/17/71
X9081			LAW	STATE ACT			PENDING			11/23/76	/ /
V3679			REDIST	U.S. HOUSE			OBJECTION		PVT-DECIDE	12/14/71	02/11/72
X6955	APPLING		POLL PL	POLL PL			NO OBJECTN			06/11/76	07/08/76
V4797	APPLING		POLL PL				WITHDRAWN			09/18/72	10/20/72
V3149	ATKINSON	PEARSON	LAW	CITY CHARTER			NO OBJECTN			06/15/71	08/13/71
A4543	BACON		POLL PL	POLL PLACES			PENDING			02/14/78	/ /
A4544	BACON		POLL PL	POLL PLACES			PENDING			02/14/78	/ /
V7051	BACON		POLL PL				NO OBJECTN			10/25/74	11/29/74
X9964	BACON	ALMA	LAW	POSTS & MAJ REQ			PENDING			0 /0 /0	/ /
X9965	BACON	ALMA	LAW	TERMS			PENDING			0 /0 /0	/ /
V3624	BACON	ALMA	ANNEX				NO OBJECTN			10/19/71	12/17/71
V8617	BAKER		LAW	SPI VTG MACHINES			NO OBJECTN			07/31/75	09/12/75
A1917	BAKER		LAW	SCH BD VACANCY			NO OBJECTN			08/02/77	09/06/77
V6100	BALDWIN		POLL PL	105 & 115TH			NO OBJECTN			01/31/74	02/22/74
V6101	BALDWIN		PRECNCT	105 & 115TH			NO OBJECTN			01/31/74	02/22/74
X1711	BALDWIN		POLL PL	POLLING PL			NO OBJECTN			06/03/76	07/02/76
V4489	BALDWIN		POLL PL				NO OBJECTN			06/24/72	08/07/72
A1898	BALDWIN	MILLEDGEVI	ANNEX	ANNEX			PENDING			0 /0 /0	/ /
A1899	BALDWIN	MILLEDGEVI	ANNEX	ANNEX			PENDING			0 /0 /0	/ /
X2211	BANKS		POLL PL	BALDWIN			NO OBJECTN			02/02/76	03/18/76